

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
CIVIL MINUTES—GENERAL

**JS-6 / REMAND**

Case No. **CV 15-5182-DMG (JPRx)**

Date **August 4, 2015**

Title ***Roger Neal Smith v. Ace Cash Express, Inc., et al.***

Page **1 of 1**

Present: The Honorable **DOLLY M. GEE, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE**

**KANE TIEN**

Deputy Clerk

**NOT REPORTED**

Court Reporter

Attorneys Present for Plaintiff(s)  
None Present

Attorneys Present for Defendant(s)  
None Present

**Proceedings: IN CHAMBERS – ORDER REMANDING ACTION TO SUPERIOR  
COURT FOR THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS  
ANGELES**

By order issued on July 20, 2015, this Court explained why it appears that it does not have removal jurisdiction over this case and ordered removing Defendant Ace Cash Express, Inc. (“Ace”) to show cause by July 27, 2015 why this action should not be remanded to State Court (“OSC”). [Doc. # 16.] In the OSC, the Court advised that “[f]ailure to timely respond to this Order shall be deemed consent to remand to State Court.” Defendant Ace has not filed any response to the OSC.

Accordingly, the Court having deemed that Defendant Ace has consented to the remand of this action to State Court and it appearing that this Court does not have removal jurisdiction of this action, IT IS ORDERED that this action is hereby remanded to the Superior Court of the State of California, County of Los Angeles. The scheduling conference on August 28, 2015 is VACATED.